



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

MW

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/027,449	12/21/2001	Richard A. Mazur	47171-00262USC2	1697

30223 7590 03/18/2004  
JENKENS & GILCHRIST, P.C.  
225 WEST WASHINGTON  
SUITE 2600  
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

BEAUCHAINE, MARK J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3653

DATE MAILED: 03/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/027,449

Applicant(s)

MAZUR ET AL.

Examiner

Mark J. Beauchaine

Art Unit

3653

M4

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 171-174, 184-198, 200-204, 214, 215, 218-222, 227-236, 243-245, 251 and 260-293 is/are rejected. <sup>-255</sup> <sub>^</sub> MB
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>24</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 171-174,184-198,200-204,214,215,218-222,227-236,243-245,251 and 260-293.

C-255  
RB

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Inventorship***

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

### ***Specification***

The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 171-174, 184-198, 200-204, 214, 215, 218-222, 227-236, 243-245, 251-255 and 260-293 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De La Rue Systems 3100 Series Operator Instructions Manual Issue 1.2 (52 Pages), dated October 1986 (hereinafter De La Rue) in view of Patent Number 5,394,992 by Winkler (hereinafter Winkler) - per claim rejection of Office Action dated 27 October 2003 (Paper Number 21) - in further view of Patent Number 4,592,090 by Curl et al (hereinafter Curl).

Although the document sorter disclosed by Winkler fails to specifically recite a rate of denominating notes of at least 800 bills a minute, such a rate of note denomination is well known in the art. Curl teaches a sheet scanning apparatus that is "used for pattern recognition; for example to sort banknotes in accordance with their orientation and their *denomination*" (emphasis added) (column 1, lines 8 plus). Furthermore, Curl clearly states that although it is "difficult to process the data . . . when scanning at the rate of 20-30 notes per second [i.e., 1200-1800 notes per minute]", it is "a common speed for banknote transport systems" (column 1, lines 39 plus). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to denominate bills via the Winkler apparatus at a rate of at least 800 bills per minute to provide a desirable bill-processing rate.

Regarding the Applicant's feature of flagging "no call" bills, Winkler teaches a document sorter having an operation that included the "separation of a 'rogue' note of a different denomination from a stack of notes" (column 5, lines 20 plus). Accordingly, the separated rogue note of Winkler reads on the Applicant's no call bill.

***Conclusion***

The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure

Patent Number 5,295,196 by Raterman et al because of its bill processing rate of 1000 bills per minute (column 15, lines 28 plus),

Japanese Patent Application Publication Number 61-14557 published 19 April 1986 because of its discharge slot (page 5, lines 6 plus), currency collection unit 23 (page 5, line 80), and its halting operation (page 8, lines 4 plus), and

Japanese Patent Application Publication Number 54-71674 published 8 June 1979 because of its discharge slot (page 24, lines 3 plus), currency collection unit 23 (page 24, line 3), and its halting operation (page 20, lines 1 and 2) and


Japanese Patent Application Publication Number 54-71673 published 8 June 1979 because of its halting operation (page 3, lines 15 plus).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark J. Beauchaine whose telephone number is (703)308-6336. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM through 5:00PM Mondays through Thursdays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Donald P. Walsh can be reached on (703)306-4173. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

mjb

  
DONALD P. WALSH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600